



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/996,623	11/28/2001	Moshe Rubin	43426.00044	5715

30256 7590 03/07/2005

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P  
600 HANSEN WAY  
PALO ALTO, CA 94304-1043

EXAMINER
----------

HENNING, MATTHEW T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/996,623

Applicant(s)

RUBIN ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew T Henning

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9-23 and 25-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 8 and 24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/18/02 8/15/02.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

This action is in response to the communication filed on 11/28/2001.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-32 have been examined.

#### ***Title***

2. The title of the invention is acceptable.

#### ***Priority***

3. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 120 is acknowledged. However, two of the non-provisional applications upon which priority is claimed fail to provide adequate support under 35 U.S.C. 112 for claims of this application. Neither application number 09/397,331 or application number 09/313,067 provide support for the limitation of "inserting special fill characters in unfilled memory locations between the markers". Because this limitation is specified in both of the independent claims 1 and 17, priority to these applications is not granted for any of the claims. However, support for these limitations is provided in application number 09/774,236.
4. Therefore, the effective filing date for the subject matter defined in the pending claims in this application is 01/29/2001.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

5. The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 1/30/2002, 3/14/2002, 6/18/2002, and 8/15/2002 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the examiner is considering the information disclosure statements.

#### ***Drawings***

6. The drawings filed on 11/28/2001 are acceptable for examination proceedings.

### *Specification*

7. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

*The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.*

*The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.*

8. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because

Line 5: The phrase "A system is also described and claimed" can be implied and therefore must be removed.

The abstract is does not provide an adequate description of the invention and readers would not get a clear picture of the invention as claimed. Also, the abstract is not of sufficient length.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

*The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.*

10. Claims 2 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Line 1 of claims 2 and 18 recite the limitation "the text string", but claims 1 and 17 both recite two different text strings. The ordinary person skilled in the art would not be able to determine which of the two text strings claims 2 and 18 are referring to, and

Art Unit: 2131

would not be able to determine the scope of the claims. Therefore, claims 2 and 18 are rejected for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

*(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.*

12. Claims 1, 5-7, 9-10, 15, 17, 21-23, 25-26 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozaki et al. (US Patent Number 6,487,543) hereinafter referred to as Ozaki, and further in view of Yergeau et al. (RFC 2070 "Internationalization of the Hypertext Markup Language") hereinafter referred to as Yergeau.

13. Regarding claim 1, Ozaki disclosed a method for altering text displayed in a formatted page, comprising: locating a buffer of memory locations containing contents of a formatted page (See Ozaki Col. 14 Paragraphs 6-7, and Col. 6 Line 39 – Col. 7 Line 7); locating a text string between two markers within the buffer (See Ozaki Col. 10 Paragraphs 10-11 and Col. 14 Paragraphs 6-7); and replacing the text string with an alternate text string (See Col. 14 paragraphs 6-7), but Ozaki failed to disclose inserting special fill characters in unfilled memory locations between the markers.

Yergeau teaches that right-to-left and left-to-right marks should be placed before a portion of text in order to provide directionality to the text (See Yergeau Section 4.2.4).

It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention to employ the teachings of Yergeau in the text retrieval system of Ozaki by placing right-to-left and left-to-right marks before the decoded text. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to provide directionality to the text in order to properly render languages written in both directions.

14. Claim 17 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above and further because it was inherent that the content was in the buffer in order for it to have been processed by the CPU as disclosed by Ozaki (See Ozaki Col. 7 Paragraph 1).

15. Regarding claims 5-6 and 21-22, the combination of Ozaki and Yergeau disclosed using a Unicode U+200E character and a U+200F character (See Yergeau Section 4.2.4). This is further evidenced by Darnell et al. (HTML 4 Second Edition Unleashed), wherein Darnell shows that the left-to-right character is represented by a U+200E, and a right-to-left character is represented by a U+200F (See Darnell Page 1079).

16. Regarding claims 7 and 23, the combination of Ozaki and Yergeau disclosed the right-to-left and left-to-right characters being placed in front of the text (See Yergeau Page 15).

17. Regarding claims 9-10 and 25-26, the combination of Ozaki and Yergeau disclosed the content being a formatted webpage, and that the webpage was in html format (See Ozaki Fig. 7 and Col. 10 Paragraphs 8-11).

18. Regarding claims 15 and 31, the combination of Ozaki and Yergeau disclosed that deciphering cipher text to produce plain text (See Ozaki Col. 14 Paragraphs 6-7).

Art Unit: 2131

19. Regarding claims 16 and 32, the combination of Ozaki and Yergeau disclosed that the html content was used to determine the display (See Ozaki Col. 12 Paragraph 8).

20. Claims 2 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Ozaki and Yergeau as applied to claims 1 and 17 above, and further in view of Yergeau.

The combination of Ozaki and Yergeau disclosed decrypting a text string to get plaintext string (See Ozaki Col. 14 Paragraphs 6-7), but failed to disclose the text string being a sequence of Unicode characters.

Yergeau teaches that Unicode can be used in html in order to allow for all languages to be displayed (See Yergeau Abstract and Section 2.2).

It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention to employ the teachings of Yergeau in the html content distribution system of Ozaki and Yergeau by providing the text strings in Unicode. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to provide content in any language using html.

21. Claims 3-4 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Ozaki and Yergeau as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of applicant admitted prior art.

Ozaki and Yergeau disclosed having html tags to indicate cipher text that needed to be decrypted (See Ozaki Col. 10 Paragraphs 10-11), but failed to disclose each marker being a Unicode U+FFFE or a Unicode U+FDEF.

Art Unit: 2131

Applicant admits that the html tag marker is represented by a Unicode U+FFFE character in INTERNET EXPLORER Version 5, and by a Unicode U+FDEF character in INTERNET EXPLORER Version 6 (See Specification Paragraph 0093).

It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention to mark the text between the tags with a Unicode U+FFFE character or a Unicode U+FDEF character. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to provide compatibility for viewing the content protected html pages in INTERNET EXPLORER Version 5 and Version 6 in order to provide flexibility to the user.

22. Claims 11-14, and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Ozaki and Yergeau as applied to claims 1 and 17 above, and further in view of Dockter et al. (US Patent Number 6,611,845) hereinafter referred to as Dockter.

Ozaki and Yergeau disclosed protecting content distributed via HTML documents (See Ozaki Col. 10 Paragraphs 8-11), but failed to disclose the content being in an XML page, a PDF, or Word document.

Dockter teaches that marked-up documents can be in various forms such as HTML, PostScript, PDF, MICROSOFT Word, XML, etc. (See Dockter Col. 5 Paragraph 1).

It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention to employ the teachings of Dockter in the content protection system of Ozaki and Yergeau by tagging cipher text in non-HTML documents such as PostScript, PDF, MICROSOFT Word, XML and decrypting the cipher text upon retrieval of the documents. This would have



Art Unit: 2131

been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to provide content protection to all documents, and not just HTML pages.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 8 and 24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

23. Claims 1-7, 9-23, and 25-32 have been rejected.

24. Claims 8 and 24 have been objected to.

25. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Cordell et al. (US Patent Number 5,778,372) disclosed a system in which a buffer is provided for displaying tagged content in a manner according to the formatting of the content.

b. Khan et al. (US Patent Number 6,438,575) disclosed a system for replacing references to tagged content with the tagged content after downloading the tagged content separately.

c. Bloomberg (US Patent Number 5,761,686) disclosed a system for replacing a text string with another text string and embedding information into the second text string.

d. Howard et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2001/0042045) disclosed a system for protecting browser content by encrypting the content and decrypting the

Art Unit: 2131

content for display and not allowing client activity while displaying the decrypted content.

e. Imielinski et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0013792) disclosed a system for displaying information using virtual tags to track the display objects.

f. Yergeau (RFC 2044) disclosed the benefit of using Unicode to represent characters instead of ASCII.

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew T Henning whose telephone number is (571) 272-3790. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Matthew Henning  
Assistant Examiner  
Art Unit 2131  
2/23/2005



**ANDREW CALDWELL**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**